



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/621,045	07/21/2000	Masayuki Takayama	848075/0016	4035

29619 7590 11/16/2006

SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP
ATTN: JOEL E. LUTZKER
919 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/621,045

Applicant(s)

TAKAYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/10/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relating to Claim 1:

In comeback to Applicant's allegation that **Yoshida** doesn't teach, "a second address data bus for connecting said control means and said display means independently of said first address data;" it is noted that the Examiner respectfully emphasize that the cited art, is legally efficient for the purpose of rendering claim unpatentable. In particular, **Yoshida** supports the declaration as, followings; basically Yoshida asserts so many lines or buses, for example buses 39-41, 36, 42, 44, consequently, bus 39 or 40 or 41 (see Fig.1) are independently connected to one of display, control section to operate independently. Particularly, bus 42 is independent data bus then bus 44, which is separately connected to the display and the control section of the device. Therefore, Yoshida emphasize the separate/independent address data buses. (Please perceive buses 39-41,36, 42, 44; Abstract), at the same time as in support; "the examiner must give the broadest reasonable interpretation to all claims presented." As stated in MPEP § 2111 - § 2111.01. Hence, it is believed that Yoshida ***still teaches the claimed limitations***.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

Art Unit: 2617

Relating to Claims 2-3:

In reappear to Applicant's allegation that Szczutkowski doesn't teach, "communication means for transmitting signals via a radio line wherein said control means is controlled to prohibit access to said second address data bus while said communication means is receiving signals;" it is noted that the Examiner respectfully emphasize that the cited art, is legally efficient for the purpose of rendering claim unpatentable. In particular, Szczutkowski supports the declaration as, display enable or disable whenever it has busy signals (see Col.8; 7-44), at the same time as in support; "the examiner must give the broadest reasonable interpretation to all claims presented." As stated in MPEP § 2111 - § 2111.01. Hence, it is believed that Szczutkowski ***still teaches the claimed limitations***

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

Sharad Rampuria /SR/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617